

REMARKS

INTRODUCTION

In accordance with the foregoing, claims 4 and 11 have been canceled, and claims 1-3, 5, 10, 12, 13, and 15-17 have been amended. No new matter is believed to have been presented, and approval and entry are respectfully requested.

Claims 1-3, 5-10, and 12-17 are pending and under consideration. Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. §102

In the Office Action at pages 2-4, claims 1-3 and 15-17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102 as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,523,028 to DiDomizio, et al. This rejection is traversed and reconsideration is requested.

Amended independent claim 1 is directed to a search system for searching design asset information to find information, which a user has privilege to access and which is requested by the user. The search system includes "a first memory that stores the design asset information," "a processor that accesses the first memory to retrieve information, which the user has privilege to access, from the design asset information stored in the first memory," and "a second memory that stores a session database in which information, which the user has privilege to access, is collected, wherein the session database is generated when the user starts a session and is deleted when the session is terminated" and "wherein the search system searches information requested by the user from the session database." Support for the amendments to independent claim 1 can be found at page 10, lines 4-29 of the originally filed Specification.

At page 4 of the Office Action, the Examiner acknowledges that DiDomizio fails to teach or suggest "a database which is generated when the user starts a session and is held until the session is terminated" and asserts that this feature is taught by U.S. Patent No. 6,246,678 to Erb, et al. at col. 34, lines 1-4. Applicant respectfully disagrees with this assertion.

Erb is directed to a data access server for PBX and, at col. 34, lines 1-4, teaches only a database for storing an access log when a session is started. Neither DiDomizio nor Erb teaches or suggests generating "a session database in which information, which the user has privilege to access, is collected wherein the session database is generated when the user starts a session and is deleted when the session is terminated, and wherein the search system

searches information requested by the user from the session database," as recited in amended independent claim 1.

Further, amended independent claim 1 provides several advantages over the prior art. In a non-limiting example, the session database of the present invention contains limited information, which the user has privileges to access. Since the search system searches only the limited information in the session database, search results can be quickly provided to the user. The search response of the search system is further improved because all of the information in the session database is collected before a search is requested by a user. In a non-limiting example, the present invention also eliminates the need for the search system to have excess storage capacity, because the session data is deleted when the user terminates the session. Additionally, in a non-limiting example, because the session database is newly generated with each new session, the session database is updated before the user requests a search. Thus, the most recent information is searched and the user is provided with the most up to date search result.

For at least these reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that DiDomizio and Erb, taken alone or in combination, fail to teach all of the features of amended independent claim 1 and those claims depending directly or indirectly therefrom. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that amended independent claim 1 and all those claims depending directly or indirectly therefrom patentably distinguish over the prior art and are in condition for allowance.

Amended independent claim 15 is directed to a method for searching design asset information stored in a memory. Amended independent claim 15 recites, in relevant part, "retrieving information, which a user has privilege to access, from the design asset information stored in the memory to generate a session database in which the retrieved privileged information is collected, when the user logs into a server computer from at least one client computer," "searching the session database, when the user inputs a search query through the client computer, for the privileged information that matches the search query," and "deleting the session database when the user logs out from the server computer." Support for these amendments can be found in the originally filed Specification, at least at page 10, lines 4-29.

Applicant respectfully submits that DiDomizio fails to teach or suggest "retrieving information, which a user has privilege to access, from the design asset information stored in the memory to generate a session database in which the retrieved privileged information is collected, when the user logs into a server computer from at least one client computer," as recited in amended independent claim 15. Further, DiDomizio fails to teach or suggest "deleting

the session database when the user logs out from the server computer." As discussed above, Applicant respectfully submits that Erb fails to cure the deficiencies of DiDomizio. For at least these reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that amended independent claim 15 patentably distinguishes over the prior art and is in condition for allowance.

As amended independent claims 16 and 17 recite features similar to those of amended independent claim 15, Applicant respectfully submits that amended independent claims 16 and 17 patentably distinguish over the prior art for reasons similar to amended independent claim 15 and, therefore, are also in condition for allowance.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. §103

In the Office Action at pages 4-8, claims 4-14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over DiDomizio in view of Erb. The reasons for the rejection are set forth in the Office Action and therefore not repeated. The rejection is traversed and reconsideration is requested.

Claims 4 and 11 have been cancelled. Claims 5-9 depend, either directly or indirectly, from amended independent claim 1. As discussed with respect to amended independent claim 1, Applicant respectfully submits that DiDomizio fails to teach all of the features of amended independent claim 1 and Erb fails to cure the deficiencies of DiDomizio. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 5-9 patentably distinguish over the prior art for at least the same reasons as amended independent claim 1, from which they depend.

Amended independent claim 10 is directed to a system for searching design information. In relevant part, amended independent claim 10 recites that the server computer includes "a processor that accesses the first memory to retrieve information, which a user has privilege to access, from the design asset information stored in the first memory and generates a session database of the retrieved privileged information when the user logs into the server computer from the client computer" wherein "the session database is deleted when the user logs out from the server computer." As discussed with respect to amended independent claim 1, Applicant respectfully submits that DiDomizio fails to teach or suggest these features of amended independent claim 10. Further, as Erb teaches only a database for storing an access log when a session is started, Erb fails to cure the deficiencies of DiDomizio.

Applicant respectfully submits that DiDomizio and Erb, taken alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest all of the features of amended independent claim 10. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that amended independent claim 10, and those claims depending directly or

indirectly therefrom, patentably distinguish over the prior art and are in condition for allowance.

CONCLUSION

In accordance with the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that all outstanding objections and rejections have been overcome and/or rendered moot. And further, that all pending claims patentably distinguish over the prior art. Thus, there being no further outstanding objections or rejections, the application is submitted as being in condition for allowance which action is earnestly solicited.

If the Examiner has any remaining issues to be addressed, it is believed that prosecution can be expedited by the Examiner contacting the undersigned attorney for a telephone interview to discuss resolution of such issues.

If there are any underpayments or overpayments of fees associated with the filing of this Amendment, please charge and/or credit the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date:

8 July 2005

By:

Allison Olenginski
Allison Olenginski
Registration No. 55,509

1201 New York Avenue, NW, Suite 700
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501